DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 026 HE 023 193

AUTHOR Molto, Tomas; And Others
TITLE Changing Patterns of Finance in Higher Education. Country Study: Spain.
INSTITUTION Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France).
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 64p.; Commissioned by the Spanish Secretary of State for Universities and Research. Annex 2 (pages 49-60) will not reproduce; all other tables contain marginally legible type.
AVAILABLE FROM OECD, 2, rue Andre Pascal, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16 France.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Delivery Systems; *Educational Economics; *Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; Enrollment Trends; Financial Policy; Financial Problems; Foreign Countries; Government Role; Higher Education; State Universities; *Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Spain; *University Reform Law (Spain)

ABSTRACT

The report examines trends and issues concerned with the financing of higher education in Spain especially since 1983 when the University Reform Law was passed. Most universities are public with private institutions playing only a minor role. The recent constant growth rate is not expected to slow despite a decline in demographic growth. A modification of degree structures and requirements is currently underway. Public allocations support 80% of the universities' direct costs, while the other 20% is financed student academic fees. Student aid is being slowly expanded. Increased university autonomy and major changes in procedures for preparing and managing university budgets have resulted from the law which also encourages universities to find new financing channels through contracts with external groups and to organize doctorate level courses as a "third cycle" of courses. Research funding is expected to undergo major change with the implementation of the National Plan for Scientific Research and Technological Development. The report details data leading to these conclusions in five chapters and three annexes. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

OECD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION

Paris, November 1988

English text only

CHANGING PATTERNS OF FINANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Country Study: Spain

This report is one of a series of country studies prepared in the framework of the OECD Education Committee activity on Changing Patterns of Finance in Higher Education. These studies have provided the background information for the preparation of a general report on this topic that will be published by the OECD.

The country study has been written by Tomás Moltó, Esteban Oroval, Gloria Orriols, Neus Pons, Ramón Torrent, lecturers of the Department of Political Economy, Public Finance and Fiscal Law of the University of Barcelona, and edited by Ramón Torrent. It was commissioned by the Spanish Secretary of State for Universities and Research.

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily commit the national authorities concerned or the Organisation.

Copyright OECD, 1988

15794

The illegibility of certain pages is due to the poor quality of the originals available.

AGP. DOC/IMP.

CONTENTS

		Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		3
1.	INTRODUCTORY SURVEY: THE PUBLIC DEBATE	6
2.	FINANCING MECHANISMS	10
3.	SURVEY OF THE STUDENT ASSISTANCE SYSTEM	19
4.	CHANGES IN BUDGET PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES	24
5.	FUTURE EVOLUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCING	27
ANNEX 1	Global data on university financing.	30
	Evolution of university expenditures Evolution of university expenditures summary table	
ANNEX 2	Data breakdown per university	40
ANNEX 3	Global data on the scholarship system	48

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Spain, aside from some exceptions not relevant to the general content of this report, the entire higher education system is integrated within the organisational structure of universities. Thus, unlike in most other countries, universities and higher education are synonymous. The university system is basically public; the role played by private institutions and universities, whose right to existence is recognised in the Constitution of 1978, is relatively residual. Two circumstances set apart the evolution of the Spanish university system, during the period under review, from that of other countries:

1. The growth rate has proceeded without interruption as regards both the number of enrolled students and the creation of new institutions. As to the future, it does not appear that the demand for admission will necessarily slow down, despite the manifest decline in the rate of demographic growth. There is, certainly, still a strong pressure on university entrance.

2. The period since 1983, when the University Reform Law (L.R.U.) was passed has witnessed particularly intense internal reform. As opposed to what may have taken place in other countries, the Spanish system cannot be regarded as consolidated or substantially modified by changes in financing policies; on the contrary, such changes as have taken place have tended to reflect internal structural changes. The reform process is not yet finished. A modification of degree structures and of the courses leading to them is under way. In addition, a reform of secondary education is about to be undertaken in order to allow for the lengthening of compulsory schooling up to the age of sixteen. This will have definite implications for higher education.

The general financing policy has not changed during the period under review. Direct costs in the running of universities are mostly met from allocations granted by the public authorities; a lesser portion is financed from academic fees (registration fees) paid by students. The relative contribution of these sources has varied during the period; from 1979 there has been a trend towards an increase in the income from fees. At the present time, the relative contributions seem to have stabilised at around 80 per cent from allocations and 20 per cent from fees for universities as a whole -- the relative contributions differ from one university to another. For reasons stated in this Report, it does not appear that this financial arrangement (as it pertains to "standard" first and second cycle courses) will be modified.

Indirect costs, mainly living expenses, are essentially met by the students themselves and their families. The students' aid system, based on academic and economic criteria (level of family income) is not very sizeable with respect either to the number of beneficiaries or the average amount of assistance. The internal structure of the system tends also to diminish its efficiency as an instrument of assistance policy. Since 1984 the system has expanded considerably, although it has not been able to overcome inherited defects. Reform of the aid system is, therefore, as yet incomplete, although the education authorities are resolved to persevere with it. It will necessarily require a substantial increase in earmarked resources which may prove very difficult to obtain considering the high economic cost to be incurred by the lengthening of compulsory schooling to age sixteen and the reform of post-compulsory secondary education.

Although general financing policy has not substantially changed, application of the L.R.U. has brought about a profound modification in the procedures for preparing and managing university budgets. This modification has been guided to a considerable extent by a desire to increase university autonomy in this area. Despite the short time-span, this Report attempts an initial evaluation of the effects of these modifications.

The L.R.U. also seeks to open up new financing channels for universities, especially by encouraging them to enter into agreements or contracts with external groups for co-operative, consulting, and service activities. The various departments and research teams have shown considerable energy in making use of these new possibilities. However, it appears clear that the funds thus obtained are used exclusively for financing only those activities that are prescribed in the agreements and that they do not make any significant contribution to the universities' general expenditures.

Traditionally, doctorate level courses could not be considered as a third cycle of studies. In fact, a third cycle in the real sense was not contemplated in the Spanish university system (whose first and second cycle courses are, conversely, long as compared with most other OECD countries) nor was this cycle taken into consideration when establishing the financing mechanisms. The L.R.U. seeks to organise doctorate level courses as a real third cycle, in a manner similar to the Anglo-Saxon model, and to promote post-graduate courses oriented towards training and recycling graduate students. The universities have received this idea favourably and many initiatives have been undertaken. However, the appropriate financing method has yet to be defined.

At present, financing mechanisms are very varied, although it seems clear that the tendency is to increase the contribution of students' fees to the first and second cycle and to make increasing use of new sources of financing, notably from external bodies. It is quite possible that these two trends will continue into the future.

The entire context of research funding will undergo a profound change with the application of the National Plan for Scientific Research and Technological Development prepared in compliance with the Law on the General Promotion and Co-ordination of Scientific and Technical Research passed in 1986. Given that publication of this Plan is imminent, it has seemed appropriate in this Report to restrict comment to the indispensable minimum.

1. INTRODUCTORY SURVEY: THE PUBLIC DEBATE

Aside from exceptions not worth considering within the general scope of this Report, all higher education in Spain is organised through universities. "Higher education" and "university" are in effect equivalent terms.

The university system is basically a public one. Private universities and colleges, whose existence is recognised in the Constitution, serve only a small number of students and are financed largely through registration fees, although they also receive subsidies from various private sources. Thus, this Report will focus on the financing mechanisms of public higher education while making reference to private education whenever appropriate.

The financing mechanisms are not complex and may be summarised as follows:

a) The direct costs of higher education (that is, the running of each institution) are mostly financed out of funds allocated to universities from the general budget of the public authorities; a small portion of these costs is covered by academic fees -- for registration and other purposes -- paid by the students. Throughout the period surveyed, the relative importance of these two sources has changed for the universities as a whole. However, the subsidy received from the public authorities still accounts for over 80 per cent of costs. Nevertheless, if considered individually, some universities are in receipt of lower subsidies than others.

b) The fees paid by students have been traditionally the same in amount for all the universities. A distinction is made between fees for the "Humanities" and fees for "Experimental" courses (scientific and technical), the latter being somewhat higher. However, the difference is relatively small and does not appear to have a discriminatory effect on student choices.

c) Aside from these generic sources of financing, there exists specific financing for research activities under the form of subsidies that are connected to specific projects commissioned by the central State departments. Traditionally, the development of research activities in co-operation with the business world has been very limited, although for the last two or three years, and under the possibilities opened up by the new university regulations, there appears to have been an increase in this type of activity.

d) The indirect costs of higher education (students' "living expenses") are mostly covered privately by the students and their families. There is some provision for scholarships and assistance, but this covers only a small part of the costs.

Throughout the period surveyed, the evolution of financing mechanisms has not substantially modified these general features:

a) There has been an increase in the global resources earmarked for direct costs. This increase has permitted the same expenditure per student to be maintained and even slightly increased throughout the period, calculated both in constant pesetas and in GNP per capita percentages. Additionally, an increase in the funds assigned for scholarships and assistance during the last years of the period surveyed has permitted a considerable increase in the number of beneficiaries.

b) Especially since 1985 there has been a trend to standardise the criteria for determining allocations, thus correcting, at least partially, the previous inequalities and imbalances.

c) Although the mechanism for financing direct costs has not substantially changed during this period, the contribution of the fees paid by students has changed, showing a tendency to increase from 1978 onwards and then stabilising, it appears, at around 20 per cent for the universities as a whole during the last two years.

Even though the general character of the financing mechanisms has not substantially changed throughout the period, important changes have taken place in budget preparation and management procedures, especially since the enactment in 1983 of the L.R.U. which develops the principle of autonomy in the universities recognised by the Constitution of 1978. These changes are generally oriented towards a very considerable enhancement of the degree of university autonomy in budget management matters. On the other hand, some universities have been affected by the changes in State administration designed in the Constitution of 1978, and the subsequent creation of Autonomous Communities.

In brief, the recent evolution of higher education financing has not resulted from substantial modifications in financing policies. In fact, the changes that have occurred which will be commented on in more detail in the following chapters, do not arise from the effect of new financing policies, but from those changes that have resulted from the solutions applied to internal university problems or from modifications in organisational and academic practices. Specifically, many such changes result from certain policies adopted by the L.R.U. concerning university staff, which entailed substantial administrative and academic modifications.

In spite of their stability, there has certainly been some controversy about the basic mechanisms of financing. Throughout the entire period, the debate has been focused on two issues. First, during the early years, when the Constitution was being drawn up in 1977 and 1978, as well as during the period when various university reforms or individual projects were being implemented, though repeatedly frustrated by parliamentary proceedings, controversy was centred around the existence of private universities and the possibility of their being publicly financed. The debate was finally closed with the enactment in 1983, at long last, of the L.R.U, which did not formally close the door to the possibility of public financing for private universities, but did not favour it in spirit. In short, it appears to be accepted, at least for the immediate future, that private universities must secure their own financing.

A second element in the debate since the middle of the period surveyed concerns the issue of public financing mechanisms. The key issue has been whether it is appropriate to finance direct costs from the State's general budget when most of the students come from medium or high income families. This debate has not reflected political differences since the vast majority of parliamentarians do not question the present system. A minority on the left calls, however, for a smaller contribution from academic fees. In effect, the debate arises from different theoretical opinions about how the public services should be financed, not least within the Ministry of Education itself.

The debate is specifically reflected in the working documents prepared by the Universities Council, which has responsibility for determining the registration fees to be paid by students. In its report published in the summer of 1986 to justify the determination for the following academic year, the principle seems to have been adopted that fees must correspond to the real costs incurred. However, the report published in 1987 appears to have taken up the contrary position. In any case, the traditional financing mechanism remains unchanged.

The reality is that political circumstances during the last two years and the conflicts generated by university problems have shown that, as in other countries, people are particularly sensitive towards any proposal to modify the system of financing. This sensitivity makes it harder to plan for increase in the contribution of private financing to university costs in the form of tuition fees. At the same time, general budgetary and public expenditure constraints also make it difficult to attempt any reduction in the amount of the financial provision. Thus, it would appear almost impossible during the coming years to plan a change in the relative contribution of student's fees and public subsidies to the financing of universities.

A major reform of the scholarship and aid system, which will entail an increase in funds, appears to be unavoidable. Yet, reform is extremely difficult to undertake in the present economic situation, especially in view of the cost of reforming secondary education and lengthening the duration of compulsory schooling that have already been mentioned.

The matters dealt with so far have implicitly concerned the most basic and traditional functions of the higher education system, namely first and second cycle courses. Other functions of higher education, whose growing importance has been emphasised in recent years and which have been the subject of specific attention in OECD documents -- continuing education, post-graduate training and re-training, third cycle training -- have not been considered. Indeed, there is little to be said concerning the financing of these areas in so far as Spain is concerned since they were not taken into account when establishing financing procedures. The only relevant post-graduate courses are in business studies and these are monopolised by private institutions.

Even so, traditional practice has been undergoing profound changes during the last two years. On the one hand, a new regulation on doctoral studies has come into force, establishing for the first time a structure for such courses as a defined cycle on a model very similar to that prevailing in Anglo-Saxon countries. On the other hand, the various universities are beginning to organise post-graduate courses oriented not so much towards the doctorate but directly towards the training and retraining of graduates.

The period surveyed, especially from 1983 onwards, has been one of internal reform of the higher education system. The reform has not yet ended; the universities are engaged at present in a complex process of reforming degree structures, study plans and curricula. The years 1988 and 1989 will be decisive for these reforms.

The period closes with the inception of an ambitious reform in the area of research policy. The Law of General Development and Co-ordination of Scientific and Technical Research, passed in 1986, totally restructures Spanish research policy and the traditional system. In compliance with this Law, the multi-annual National plan for Scientific Research and Technological Development entails, on the one hand, the precise definition of objectives for the first time, and on the other hand, a substantial increase in the public resources allocated to research. During the years ahead, universities, in their role as research institutions, will be decisively affected by the implementation of the plan.

2. FINANCING MECHANISMS

As already stated, the mechanisms for financing higher education have not undergone any major transformation during recent years. There have certainly been changes in the regulations governing the preparation and management of university budgets.

The general features of the financing arrangements and recent changes will be set forth in the following sections:

-- Current expenditures;

-- Investment expenditures;

-- Universities' resources: global evolution;

-- Research funding;

-- New financing channels;

-- Financing of universities within the process of establishing the autonomous communities.

Current Expenditures

Determining the current budget

From the beginning of the seventies, the universities were legally considered autonomous administrative entities, and as such they had their own budgets as well as a certain degree of autonomy over them. Their own budgets did not include, however, the total amount of their expenses. Real investment expenditures and the means of financing them were not integrated in each institutional budget but under specific items in the Ministerial department having responsibility for higher education. This department thus directly financed and managed real investment expenditures. More significantly, the same control applied to a large portion of the expenditure on staffing. As in other university systems, the rapid increase in student enrolments necessitated the appointment, in addition to the traditional categories of professors with civil service status, of an ever increasing number of teaching staff on contract not enjoying that status. So much so that contract staff very soon outnumbered the traditional civil service faculty. Expenses on "new" contract teaching staff were incorporated into the respective university budgets since they were their "own" personnel, but the funds allocated for "civil service" faculty were included in the budgetary items attached to the State General Budget for the responsible Ministry department and were subtracted from the universities own budget to which the faculty members were formally assigned.

The universities' own budgets, without real investment expenditures and without a proportion of faculty expenses, were largely financed out of the subsidies they received from the Ministry and partly financed out of registration fees paid by the students themselves, which were the same in amount for all universities and fixed by the State. Each university budget was jointly approved along with the State General Budget allocation.

In a somewhat simplified manner, it could be said that determination of the universities' budgets was based on the two principles of "consolidated expenditure" as regards the budget expenses and a "levelling" subsidy as regards revenues. In practice, this method of financing suffered from serious political and technical defects. By means of the "principle of consolidated expenditure", the relationship between the universities, the Ministry department, and the Ministry of Finance was governed by the attempt on the part of the former to obtain in any one year authorisations for expenditure that would become "consolidated" the following year. This relationship had even become ritualised. Thus, it had been established that all proposals for increasing contract teaching and non-teaching staff would be presented as financed by the larger individual income of each University so as to show that these proposals would not necessitate a bigger subsidy chargeable to the State General Budget. In fact, this was a mere rhetorical exercise since what was really sought was an authorisation for the increase, so that it would become a "consolidated expenditure" which, in the next year's budget, would have to be covered, in the last resort, by the "levelling subsidy". Through this same mechanism, privileged or discriminatory treatment on the part of some authority in the Ministry department towards a specific university tended to become perpetuated even when the authority in question had left office.

By means of the criteria of "levelling subsidies, a trend was created whereby the lower the independent income of any one university for a given level of "consolidated expenditures" the greater the subsidy allocated. This trend caused, on the one hand, a lack of responsibility on the part of the universities to secure their own income, and, on the other hand, an encouragement to hide whatever income they did manage to obtain.

The flaws just described in the procedure for determining each universities' current expenditure needs were frequently corrected by the civil servants in charge of budget implementation. These officials, aware of certain inequalities among universities, tried to break the automatic routine of the procedures and to introduce correctives. It is, nevertheless, obvious that corrective measures could only be effective within narrow margins and could not eliminate the fundamental flaws.

Autonomy in the management of current expenditures

The joint approval of university budgets and State General budgets meant that the subsidies chargeable to the State Budget were not generic; the various items of expenditure were qualitative and quantitatively specified in the initial budget approved for the different universities. It was, however, in the management of their budget that universities enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy.

In principle, this autonomy was nil with respect to expenditures involving teaching and non-teaching contract staff. The budget simply established the required allocations for financing the approved level of staffing. These, as well as salary levels, were established by the Ministry department and the Ministry of Finance, both of which had to approve even the slightest modification.

The degree of autonomy was greater with respect to the remaining operational expenditures. On the one hand, the universities were legally authorised to make credit transfers among the different items other than staff. On the other hand, a university could freely attach to operational expenditures revenue greater than that budgeted, which might be generated during the fiscal year. This possibility of raising additional self-generated revenue was significant because, in effect, the universities initial budget tended to underestimate systematically this revenue simply because the tuition fees to be paid by the students were underestimated.

The net result is that a university's operational budget may substantially differ from its initial budget. This fact must be taken into account when considering the data on initial budgets shown in the annex.

Changes introduced by the (L.R.U.)

Enactment of the L.R.U. and its subsequent implementation have brought about an important change in the legal character of universities. This change has been especially relevant in the area of budgetary management, although it has not represented a substantial modification, from the standpoint of economic policies, in methods of financing. The change has been generally oriented towards a considerable increase in the degree of university autonomy in the management of their own budgets, and may be summarised under the following headings.

"Integration" of University Budgets

With this expression we refer to the fact that, subsequent to the L.R.U. enactment, the budget for each university included the total amount of expenditure items (at least, current expenditures). Specifically, the L.R.U. rules that allocations for civil service faculty members which, as mentioned before,

were previously subtracted from each budget and shown as expenditure items attached to the Ministry department and directly managed by the latter, be integrated into the respective budget for each university.

Budget preparation and approval by each university

The L.R.U. creates a new body for each university, the Social Council, comprising university representatives and a majority of community representatives appointed by different social organisations). This new body is commissioned to approve the Budget.

This means that the subsidy allocated to a university is a global one unattached to any specific purpose. Based on this global subsidy and the provision of their own funds, each university prepares its budget for approval by the Social Council. As an exception to this principle, however, the L.R.U. establishes a controlling mechanism whereby the total amount of credits for expenditures on staffing must be subject to the approval of the public authorities that allocate the subsidies.

Greater university autonomy in budget management

Even prior to the L.R.U. universities enjoyed autonomy in managing the credits allocated for operational costs, excluding staffing expenditures. Thus, acknowledgement in the L.R.U. of the principle of budgetary management autonomy does not represent, from a legal viewpoint, other than an extension of the already existing freedom.

On the other hand, the new system does entail profound modifications with respect to the degree of control on expenditures incurred by universities. Before the L.R.U., they were subject to administrative controls as to the legality of their expenditures, a control conducted by an official of the Ministry of Finance appointed for the purpose to each university, in advance of expenditures being incurred. The L.R.U. puts an end to this procedure now limiting it to a much more lax "after the fact" control.

Effects of the changes introduced by the L.R.U. on financing mechanisms. Objective criteria for the allocation of subsidies

In granting universities the right to prepare and approve their own budgets, it would seem that the L.R.U. has abandoned the logic of the principles of "consolidated expenditure' and the "levelling subsidy" on which budget allocations were previously based. In fact, the intention of L.R.U. is to create a global subvention for each university. The differential allocations will be determined by certain objectives criteria such as the number and type of students and the site area, as in other countries.

Nevertheless, application of the L.R.U. has generated a hybrid situation arising from the continuing use of traditional mechanisms. In effect, the subventions granted to universities by the public authorities are still derived from those allocated prior to the L.R.U, through the mechanism set forth in the preceding subsection. Yet, the calculation in fixing this subsidy has been the object of two important corrections.

The first correction is based on revenue and is applied for the years 1985 and 1986. As stated before, the principle of a "levelling subsidy" called for public authorities subsidies to cover the difference between the universities' own revenue and their level of authorised expenditures. Prior to 1985, this calculation was derived from each university's own revenue in previous years. From that date onwards, calculations have been based on objective levels (number and type of student), own income from academic fees (registration fees, etc.), whether or not the resulting estimate is equal to the amounts foreseen or settled in the previous budget. Once this calculation is completed, the subvention continues "levelling" these revenues until the foreseen figure for authorised expenditures is met.

The second correction works through the authorised expenditures channel. The transitory provisions in the L.R.U. entrusted the administration with the obligation of providing the necessary additional funds to place university teaching staffs within the new categories contemplated under the L.R.U. In compliance with these provisions, the Ministry department chose not to start from the number and status of the existing faculty members in each university, but instead to calculate the "theoretical" number of teaching personnel which would correspond to each university's needs on the basis of objective criteria (number and type of student). Afterwards, a longer term budgetary plan was designed, first covering up to 1987, and then up to 1992. Thus, universities receive each year an increment which allows them to place progressively their teaching staffs within the categories foreseen in the L.R.U. and also to approach the number of lecturers "theoretically" calculated which correspond to each one. In so far as the situation prior to L.R.U. was characterised by considerable inequalities among the universities with respect to allocations for teaching staff, implementation of this longer term plan represents an important balancing mechanism in the distribution of subsidies among universities. This correcting method has also been adopted with respect to non-teaching staff (administration and services) and in determining authorised operational expenditures.

In summary: although the L.R.U. entrusted the public authorities with the obligation of granting universities global subsidies which cannot formally be determined on the basis of expenditures in universities budgets, and which are established autonomously once essential information is available, in effect the subsidies allotted in compliance with the L.R.U. are still being fixed on the basis of detailed expenditure needs calculated in one way or another by the public authorities, from which the

universities own anticipated revenue is subtracted. However, the corrective mechanisms mentioned above do permit allocations to be applied in the direction of redressment. As a result, the system is becoming increasingly similar to that in other countries where global sums are allocated on the basis of objective criteria.

Real Investment Expenses

Throughout the whole of the period surveyed, the amount of funds allotted to capital investment has been important, especially during the initial years. However, because of the rapid rise in enrolments, and the parallel creation of new institutions and centres, shortages of facilities and equipment have continued.

The capital investment has been largely provided out of the allocations to the Ministry department from the national budget. Investments have also been directly managed by the Ministry. The universities have negotiated on an annual basis with the Ministry department the investments to be made without formalising, as a rule, a longer term investment plan to be implemented in a rigorous manner. As a result, the Ministry has enjoyed a considerable degree of discretion when deciding where investments should be made.

This method of financing underwent only one important change after 1980, especially from 1988 onwards, when capital expenditure equivalent to from one fourth to one sixth of total investment expenditure was directly incorporated into each universities' own budget. However, overall budgetary constraints in 1985 caused the disappearance of this formula and a return to the previous system of financing almost exclusively out of the national budget.

Enactment of the L.R.U. was also intended to lead to profound changes in the area of investment expenditures. On the one hand, funds were to be transferred to each university by the public authorities to increment their global subsidies. On the other hand, the L.R.U. opened the way for borrowing by universities for their investment financing with Ministry approval.

In practice, the tendency has been one of extreme caution when applying the new L.R.U. provisions, which have only been in force, at any rate, in 1986 and 1987. At present there is, as a consequence, no way of knowing whether a real change is taking place.

Global evolution of resources

Annexes I and II show basic statistical data on the evolution of university budgets. However, except for the more general data, these are hard to interpret since the series cannot be considered as standard (and it would be hard to standardize them) as a result of changes in the budgetary procedures commented on in this section.

On the other hand, as already pointed out, the financing system has created throughout the period an almost necessary and quantitatively very important divergence between initial and operational budgets. In fact, the significant statistics would be those relating to the operation of the budget, for these reflect the reality of the fiscal year. However, analysis of these statistics is one of the great tasks for the future in charting the evolution of the Spanish University system. Right now, even the relevant date for each university has not been compiled. Moreover, the figures for student numbers should be treated with caution. There is no certainty that the information supplied by universities is homogeneous. For one thing, the significant number of part-time students in certain universities is not distinguished from the number of full-time students. Thus, it is necessary to refer almost exclusively to overall trends, that become evident in the tables of Annex I.

As can be seen in the table, the increase in overall resources allotted to universities as a whole has been remarkable. It has permitted a slight increase in expenditures per student throughout the period, from 33,267.8 pesetas in 1975 to 39,273.4 pesetas in 1985, despite the weak growth in GNP per capita. In other words, the trend in expenditure per student has been upwards rather than downwards as in other OECD countries, though it must be recalled that the absolute expenditure per student remains comparatively low.

Funding Research and Post-graduate Studies

During the period surveyed, expenditure on research has been a minor item in university expenditures. Moreover, research has been treated as an adjunct to the teaching function and the expenses devoted to it. Except for private initiatives by university departments or individual researchers, the only stable income added to initial budgets came from the central bureau having competence in research matters (the C.A.I.C.Y.T.). In future, however, the outlook for research funding will be decisively changed thanks to the National Plan for Scientific Research and Technological Development which is being prepared in compliance with the Law on the General promotion and Co-ordination of Scientific and Technical Research passed in 1986 and will be published soon.

Although the L.R.U. deals especially with the preparation and management of university budgets rather than with the general features of their financing policies, it also seeks to foster the search for new modes of financing on the part of universities themselves. Specifically, it eliminates some administrative obstacles so as to allow for teaching staff to engage in research and consultancy work. These changes are connected with the specific issue of how to finance postgraduate courses, which were not conceived in the past as a real third cycle in higher education.

It is not surprising that universities which have accepted with considerable enthusiasm this particular goal of the L.R.U. have considered the financing of post-graduate studies as a focus for experiment. There is at present a great variety of methods for financing post-graduate studies. These include payment of registration fees by students to cover, in varying proportions, their direct costs and subsidies from outside groups who participate in certain programmes.

Effects on Financing of the Process of Regionalisation

The reform of regional organisation contained in the Spanish Constitution of 1977 has only had an effect on the financing of universities since 1985-86. The new organisation is based on the distribution of political power between the Central State and the "Autonomous Communities". There are, however, marked differences in the powers and services assumed by the Communities. Specifically, some have assumed competences in university matters while others have not.

The competences of the Communities (Basque country, Catalonia, Valencia, Andalousia, and the Canary Islands) that now have oversight of universities are as follows:

a) Global subsidies for current and research expenditures are funded by the general budgets of the respective Communities and approved as integral items of their annual budgets;

b) The fees paid by students are fixed by the government of each Community within margins established by the Universities Council (the agency which links representatives from all Spanish universities, as well as the central and autonomous authorities having competences in university matters). In practice, the fees are standard for the different types of courses, throughout Spain, in so far as the margin established by the Universities Council is considerably narrow and it has become generalised practice for the autonomous governments to adhere to central Government decisions.

c) The Communities are charged with the central functions attributed to the public authorities under the L.R.U. (authorising global credits for staff, authorising universities to borrow for investment financing, "auditing of expenditures, etc.).

d) Universities transferred to the Communities only receive from the national budget those specific transfers for research activities and infrastructures referred to above, in so far as competences in preparation and fulfilment of a national research policy are still attributed to the central administration.

It is too soon to appraise the changes brought about by the transference of some universities to the control of a community. Yet, it seems clear that these changes arise not so much as a result of the transference process itself but as a consequence of the financial status of the various communities in general and the expenditure priorities that each establishes. In effect, even after the latest agreement at the end of 1986, there are still differences remaining among the communities concerning their general financing position.

3. SURVEY OF THE STUDENT ASSISTANCE SYSTEM

General Features

In many European countries, the debate on how to finance university students dates back to the fifties. Sometimes led by parliamentary committees or, at any rate, with the participation of the different political alignments and social groups, this debate generated decisions on which the student-aid systems now in force, with greater or less modifications, were based. The Spanish experience has been radically different. The scholarship and aid system during the previous political regime, was not democratically debated and universities had the least financial resources when compared with other European countries.

Here the intention is to explain some of the distinctive features of the Spanish system:

a) It is a unique scholarship and aid system financed by the State, without the participation of other public departments or agencies. The regional devolution process launched by the Constitution of 1977, and the subsequent creation of Autonomous Communities, have not affected its structure.

b) The system is integrated within a general framework which includes all educational levels, especially post-compulsory secondary education. Up to 1984 the amount of economic resources allocated to this level is greater than that for higher education. Since 1984 the situation has been reversed as funds for higher education have been greatly increased.

c) Student assistance is in the form of non-refundable grants. There are no loans.

d) The system is not uniform for all students. In order to obtain a scholarship, a student must have achieved a certain level of academic attainment and satisfied certain economic conditions. The relative weight attached to academic and economic circumstances has been changing in favour of the latter.

e) The system is not designed to make individual students financially independent. Family income determines the level of support.

f) There are no specific policies for specific categories of students, be they full-time or part-time students, employed or not, men or women or young or adult in specific courses of study.

g) Direct financial aid is complemented by assistance in kind -- basically lodging (university dormitories) and meals (served in university dining halls). Dormitories and dining halls are decentralised with varying degrees of attachment to a university; their scope is relatively reduced and they serve a limited number of students. Normally, the price of services is not too far removed from market levels. There is no integration of financial aid and other services.

h) The type of scholarship and other aid has only slightly varied over the years and may be summarised as follows:

   -- below a determined level of "per capita" family income, students are entitled to exemption from registration fees;

   -- below a still lower income level students are entitled to "compensatory aid" to help cover their living expenses;

   -- students may also be entitled to certain assistance for study materials and a subsidy based on the distance between their institution and their home.

Critical Survey of the System

The socialist government that came into power at the end of 1982 set as its primary objective the promotion of a university scholarships system. From 1984 onwards there was a clear expansion of this system both in the volume of financing and the number of students receiving assistance. With four years the total of scholarships was triplicated and the number of students benefiting was almost doubled.

This financial support, progressively increasing each year, palliates in some measure the enormous inherited deficiencies of the system both as regards overall resources and the amount of grants. Nevertheless, the situation remains unsatisfactory in both respects. Specifically, for a good number of the beneficiaries, who in any case represent only a relatively limited percentage of the total number of students, the amount of assistance received is rather small in relation to the indirect costs of being a student.

In parallel with the economic effort designed to promote the system of scholarships and other assistance, the Ministry of Education evaluates the way it is managed. This is difficult owing to the fact that in the past there was no established data base. However, the evaluation exercise for the period 1983 to 1986 shows that:

a) There are considerable imbalances in the distribution of scholarships among students in the various universities;

b) There is unequal treatment of potential beneficiaries as regards verification of their economic circumstances, not least because of the prevailing practices of fiscal fraud and concealed incomes. Although fiscal controls are being improved, applicants for assistance whose income is fully exposed (that is, the children of salaried workers) are penalised vis-à-vis the sons of small business owners, farmers or manufacturers, and the self-employed.

c) There is inefficiency resulting from the contradictions generated between establishing academic requirements for obtaining and renewing assistance common for all types of courses but with small variations and the enormous inequalities that exist in the academic performance of students in the various types of courses. Thus, although in general the rate of lost scholarships is relatively high throughout the courses of study, the rate of loss is particularly severe for some types of courses (notably, science and technology). In practice, the system tends to favour students attending courses in which the academic requirements are most easily met. This means, in turn, that students are financially disadvantaged in some of the very courses that the authorities wish to encourage.

d) Inadequate integration of university scholarships within the general system of scholarships and assistance at all educational levels, specifically, integration with the scholarship system at the post-compulsory secondary educational level. there is too much discontinuity between beneficiaries at the upper secondary and higher education levels.

In the 1987-1988 academic year, the financial effort has been sustained, there being an increase in the allocation. Simultaneously, modifications have been made in the regulations with a view to correcting the defects in internal management. If it is still too soon to assess the precise effects of these modifications, it would seem clear that there has been some progress in the direction of greater efficiency and equity.

As already stated, there was no provision for a third post-graduate-cycle of higher education until the L.R.U. was enacted. The following points can now be made:

a) as in a few other european countries, a significant proportion of doctoral theses was prepared in the past by candidates who had joined a university as assistant

professors or professors in training. These candidates, in addition to preparing their doctoral theses, undertook departmental teaching duties, especially supervising practical or laboratory classes. This activity was greater or less depending on such circumstances as teaching loads and the number of professors in the different departments.

b) The ministry of education financed, and continues to finance, a research staff training programme granting scholarships for post-graduate studies and, specifically, for preparing doctoral theses both in spain -- in the majority of cases -- and abroad. These scholarships are granted according to the academic merits of applicants. The ministry distributes the total allocation for each university and the universities are responsible for determining priorities in the selection of students.

c) Aside from the two financing mechanisms mentioned, there has been a significant number of post-graduate students financing their own studies, especially abroad, on the basis of scholarships and assistance granted by different public, semi-public and private spanish institutions or scholarships provided for in inter-governmental agreements or directly granted by foreign agencies or universities.

d) The number of post-graduate students financing their own studies is probably very small. Within this group, the most significant percentage constituted those who prepared their doctoral thesis, normally over a long period of time, while holding a job of pre-university educational levels or outside the educational system.

In fact, throughout the period surveyed the doctoral candidate was considered a "professional" student preparing his thesis not so much as a continuation of his second cycle studies, but rather as a first step in his professional career, normally within the university system itself. When appraising these features the long duration, as compared to other countries, of first and second cycle courses (a minimum of five years for second cycle graduation) must be taken into account.

As already stated in the second section, changes in financing procedures and budget management have not been so much a reflection of conceptual changes in economic policy as an accompaniment to the internal changes taking place in university structures which necessarily have had financial consequences. It must be remembered that, unlike other countries, Spain had not arrived at a consolidated university pattern whose essential features have been maintained throughout the period under review. On the contrary, the recent period of university reform which, although now well on its way, has not yet terminated since during the next two years modifications in the course content leading to the various degrees must also be made.

The nature of these changes has been explained before. As to their effects, it must be emphasised that the L.R.U. sought not financial or budgetary but academic reforms. The law seeks to promote university autonomy in general, especially to promote the participation of universities in the selection and promotion of teaching staffs. To this end, it was considered that the total amount of funds for financing teaching staff expenditures should be included in each university's own budget, so that it can dispose of teaching posts and can appoint the respective commissions for evaluating candidates.

Thus, an evaluation of the new status of teaching staff as established by the L.R.U. should be conducted, fundamentally, on academic criteria relating to the levels of appointments. Such criteria require a longer term perspective. Nevertheless, some thoughts may be advanced on the effects that this new status will have on the budgetary behaviour of universities.

In effect, although the total allocations to each university for financing their teaching staff expenditures are calculated by means of objective criteria centrally determined by the ministry of education, their distribution among the various categories of teaching staff is under each university's own competence. Thus, each university must decide on the distribution of posts within departments. There is no doubt that this has necessitated a substantial change in the relationships between universities and the competent ministry department. Prior to the L.R.U. the latter acted with a considerable degree of discretionary judgement as regards the distribution of teaching staff positions to the universities and departments within them. In fact, the process of distribution tended to subject the ministry department to all kinds of corporate and individual pressures which could be conflictual and even contradict the very proposals made by a given university. In this respect, leaving aside any future evaluations of the merits of the professors individually selected or promoted on the basis of the new procedures, the judgement on the new status of teaching staffs and the new financing mechanisms must be clearly a positive one.

On the one hand, universities now have to prepare overall management criteria concerning such delicate matters as the distribution of teaching staff positions. Preparation of these criteria, notwithstanding their possible variations from one university to another, has tended to correct imbalances in teaching staff allocations within each institution and departments and for different types of courses.

On the other hand, the corporate and individual pressures now confront one another not in the ministry offices, but inside each university. The distribution of teaching positions has thus become transparent and there has been a greater feeling of co-operation among the various sections and departments of each university.

4. CHANGES IN BUDGET PREPARATION AND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

The changes introduced by the L.R.U. in the procedures for preparing and managing university budgets was summarised in section 2. Despite their short life, some results can be safely reported:

a) Universities have strengthened their administrative and management organisation, especially at the top (central management, Deans' offices, and Social Councils). In a number of universities high level administrative staff have been recruited from outside and new administrative services have been created.

b) There is a tendency to generalise about the relationship in financial matters between the universities and the public authorities that allocate the subsidies for their operations (the Central Administration or Autonomous Communities, as the case may be), whereas prior to the L.R.U. that relationship was concerned with specific revenue and expenditure items.

c) There is a growing tendency for universities to prepare long-term rather than annual investment plans that may solve defects in their infrastructures and equipment shortages. The general assessment of these tendencies must be positive insofar as it involves, as in the case of modifications to the status of teaching staff, the adoption of management and global programming criteria in the short and long term. Yet, some serious dangers are looming that must be pointed out.

In the first place, the strengthening of senior positions in the structural and administrative organisation, although inevitable (and even recommended in the reports issued by international experts) may clash with the relative unsuitability of the staff recruited for that purpose. The level of such staff may well be lower than that of the Ministry's staff whose former tasks they now discharge with the increase in budgetary autonomy of each university. On the other hand, the professional administrators recruited from outside the universities may not be sufficiently knowledgeable about such a complex and distinctive reality as a teaching and research institution. In particular, they may turn out to be insufficiently sensitive to those perennial university goals that are hard to quantify, as well as to the peculiarities of an organisation that is self-managed to a considerable degree.

In the second place, eliminating administrative controls prior to expenditure may lead to a certain lack of rigour in budget planning and management. There has been evidence, at least in some cases, of a tendency to weaken excessively the restrictive criteria previously used to control expenditures on staff, especially administrative and service staff.

New Sources of Financing

The L.R.U. encourages universities to raise their own income through research and consulting contracts, or co-operative agreements, as well as through rendering and selling services. In quite a number of universities, this provision of the law has been implemented through the setting up of foundations for the purpose of securing and managing outside funds. These new regulations have only been in force since 1985, and it is therefore not possible to assess quantitatively the results with any degree of accuracy, but it does appear that universities are making extensive use of them.

In several universities, the funds collected from external activities, although not great as yet as a proportion of their total budgets, are quite large as a proportion of the amounts previously available for financing research projects. At the same time, the following points need to be made:

a) The signing of outside contracts, especially by certain universities, is still made significantly with public sector agencies;

b) It does not seem that, through the signing of such contracts, universities are financing a portion, however small, of their general expenditures. Rather, the funds collected tend to finance specific additional expenditures named in the contracts as well as to complement the remuneration of the staff concerned (article 11 of the L.R.U. opened up this possibility).

c) There is a dangerous tendency for contracts to direct research towards those fields which have the easiest access to subsidies to the detriment of more "fundamental" or less "commercialised" fields.

d) The universities as such, or the foundations created or promoted by them, have not yet found a way of taking an active role in the search for co-operative agreements with non-university groups. The initiative in adopting these agreements still lies almost exclusively with the various departments or the foundations created by them, with the universities tending to play a passive role in the management of the funds collected.

e) Finally, it must be recalled that these new sources of finance are also being applied strictly to the teaching field within the post-graduate training and recycling area.

In section three of this Report the fundamental aspects of the system of financial assistance to students was analysed. It was stated there that no procedure was established for the statistical follow-up of the system's operation and results. The first study carried out by the Ministry covered the period 1983-1986.

Although no corrobatory evidence exists, it appears that the widening of access to university has been due not so much to the assistance policy as to the policy of establishing new institutions. In effect, the creation of new institutions greatly reduces the indirect costs of higher education for students who would otherwise have been obliged to travel some distance to university: it also encourages young people to become students who would not previously have thought of doing so. At the same time, budgetary restrictions mean that these new centres lack the material resources (support services, libraries, etc.) and high level teaching staff to be found in well-established centres.

5. FUTURE EVOLUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCING

The financing of universities in Spain during the period under review has not evolved from an already consolidated higher education system. On the contrary, a profound transformation of the entire education system has been taking place precisely during this period.

The fact that the reform process is still only at midway makes it particularly difficult to predict the future. It may be pointed out, first of all, however, that the Spanish system has already gone through what amounts to an initial expansion phase. At the present time, enrolment rates are comparable with those in most OECD countries, although secondary school attendance figures remain in the low or medium range. Moreover, it does not seem that stabilisation of enrolments has been reached, despite a clear decline in demographic growth. In fact, year after year there is continuing evidence of a growing social demand for access. Moreover, the notion is rapidly gaining momentum, as in other countries, that the contemporary technological challenge demands overall improvement of the education system, both quantitative and qualitatively. It will be prudent, therefore, to take the position that, in approaching the year 2000, it is still necessary to continue to expand the system of higher education.

In turn, it is necessary to be prepared to face the need for increasing public expenditures in absolute terms. Undoubtedly, this presents very serious budgetary problems which can only be addressed if the debate on higher education financing takes place within a larger debate on social priorities and public expenditure in general.

For reasons already stated, it is scarcely possible to modify substantially the mechanisms for financing first and second cycle degree courses. The relative contributions of students' fees and subventions from public budgets appear to have stabilised in percentages at around 20 per cent and 80 per cent, respectively for the universities as a whole.

Particularly problematic is the future of student assistance policies. Lacking in Spain is the comprehensive reform of student scholarships and grants introduced in many European countries during the period 1950 and 1970. The economic crisis occurred before such a reform could be introduced. The Socialist government, in office since 1984, has increased the funds allocated to the system and the number of students in receipt of grants but has not modified the system's structural features.

In the future, the student aid system will depend upon two factors:

a) The Law on Access to University. The link between access and aid policies is quite obvious: it would be difficult for eligible candidates to exercise their right to enrol in a university in the absence of a comprehensive assistance policy which enables students to reside outside their homes.

b) The reform of post-compulsory secondary education and the lengthening of compulsory schooling up to the age of sixteen. Until now the system of scholarships and aid to university students has been integrated within a general system also encompassing post-compulsory school attendance. This period will be reduced to two years, in principle, and will modify the scholarship and aid system.

The future of the scholarship and aid system will be determined by choices: whether to have generalised assistance for all students or only for those in economic need; whether students will be expected to be independent of or dependent on family incomes; whether to have a system which takes into consideration, as at least one of its goals, the financial independence of students or a system based on the premise that students are and must continue to be financially independent of their families? What seems clear is that an increase in resources is unavoidable. The question then arises: will the authorities make available sufficient resources to permit a profound reform or will the resources be only sufficient to permit gradual expansion without structural transformation?

The recent expansion of courses in the third cycle leading to a doctorate degree or offering post-graduate training seems to be on its way towards consolidation. From the standpoint of financing, it appears that these courses will not reflect the pattern relating to first and second cycles. Direct costs will continue to be financed by the students themselves and will be much higher than for the first and second cycles. However, some students may obtain financial support from private sources.

It also appears that public and private provision will coexist at the third cycle level. While there are no signs of expansion in private education sector activities for the first and second cycles, one can discern a dynamic proliferation of new initiatives in the third cycle area both on the part of the public and private sectors.

The changes in research funding are also being consolidated. On the one hand, there appears to be a trend for university departments and research teams to seek a variety of co-operative and consultancy contracts. On the other hand, the institution of the National Plan on Scientific and Technological Research will lead to a steady increase in research funding. But three questions will remain:

a) Will the Plan succeed in integrating the decentralised initiatives of departments and research teams so that they fit in with its own priorities?

b) Will the universities as such succeed in establishing co-operative relationships with outside bodies in the research field? At present, initiatives are confined to departments and teams?

c) Will industry, especially the private sector, respond adequately to the effort being made by the public sector to expand research and development? It must be remembered that Spanish industry has tended traditionally to import new technology rather than to generate its own.

A decisive issue for the future will concern the role of international co-operation in designing, developing, and financing both educational and research activities. At present, the need for an international and specifically European outlook is included in all Spanish documents and analyses dealing with issues related to higher education and research policies. It could even be said that there is a certain risk of future disappointment because of too high hopes being placed in membership of the EEC.

ANNEX 1: GLOBAL DATA ON UNIVERSITIES FINANCING (in million pesetas)

Evolution of Universities Expenditures during the period 1972-81(1)

A) **Current Account**

- Item 1:
  - . Universities Budget
  - . MEC (or MUI Budget)

  TOTAL
- Item 2:
  - . Universities Budget
  - . MEC Budget
- Item 4:
  - . (Universities Budget)
- Global allotment, to be distributed, MEC Budget.

TOTAL A)

B) CAPITAL ACCOUNT

- Construction and equipment investments

. Construction, facilities, and school equipment Board
. Universities Budget

TOTAL

- Teaching staff training and educational research
- University scientific research
- Item 8, Universities Budget

TOTAL B)

SUMMARY A & B

---

(1) Data for initial Budgets. INAPE expenditures are not included.

EVOLUCIÓN DEL GASTO EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES, DURANTE EL PERIODO 1972-81 (1)

(en millones de pesetas)

	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
A) OPERACIONES CORRIENTES							
- Capítulo 1º:							
. Presupuesto Universidades	2.434,5	2.436,6	2.889,8	4.779,5	6.388,2	9.080,2	10.264,5
. Presupuesto MEC (o MUI)	1.742,7	1.882,6	2.236,2	2.890,7	3.960,5	5.147,2	7.324,0
TOTAL	4.177,2	4.319,2	5.126,0	7.670,2	8.348,7	14.227,4	17.588,5
- Capítulo 2º							
. Presupuesto Universidades.....	1.463,4	1.902,0	2.283,4	2.649,0	2.946,5	3.339,6	4.268,5
. Presupuesto MEC..	234,2	54,4	-	-	-	-	-
- Capítulo 4º (presupuesto Universidades)	12,4	12,5	7,6	79,8	79,9	91,9	111,4
- Dotación global, a distribuir, Presupuesto MEC	487,4	564,4	758,8	187,7	292,2	286,5	239,7
TOTAL A)	6.374,6	6.912,5	8.175,8	10.586,7	12.227,3	17.945,4	24.208,1
B) OPERACIONES DE CAPITAL							
- Inversiones en construcción y equipamiento:							
. Junta de Construcciones, instalaciones y Equipo Escolar	2.826,0	2.638,8	2.354,7	2.359,3	3.654,6	4.221,0	4.010,0
. Presupuesto Universidades	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	2.826,0	2.638,8	2.354,7	2.359,3	3.654,6	4.221,0	4.010,0
- Formación del profesorado e Investigación educativa	-	-	-	22,0	284,0	384,0	412,8
- Investigación científica Universitaria	165,0	85,5	170,4	198,4	198,4	348,4	348,4
- Capítulo 8º Presupuesto Universidades	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,4
TOTAL B)	2.991,0	2.724,3	2.525,1	2.579,7	4.137,0	4.953,4	4.772,6
RESUMEN A + B	9.365,6	9.636,8	10.700,9	13.166,4	16.364,3	22.898,8	28.980,7

(1) Datos referidos a Presupuestos iniciales. No está incluido gastos del INAPE

Evolution of Universities Expenditures during the period 1972-81(1) (In million pesetas)

A) **Current Account**

- Item 1:
  . Universities Budget
  . MEC (or MUI Budget)

  TOTAL
- Item 2:
  . Universities Budget
- Item 4:
  (Universities Budget)
- Global allotment, to be distributed, MEC Budget.

TOTAL A)

B) CAPITAL ACCOUNT

- Construction and equipment investments
  . Construction, facilities, and school equipment Board
  . Universities Budget

  TOTAL

- Teaching staff training and educational research
- University scientific research
- Item 8, Universities Budget

TOTAL B)

SUMMARY A & B

---

(1) Data for initial Budgets. INAPE expenditures are not included.

EVOLUCION DEL GASTO EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES, DURANTE EL PERIODO 1979-81 (1)

(en millones de pesetas)

	1979	1980	1981
A) OPERACIONES CORRIENTES			
- Capítulo 1º:			
. Presupuesto Universidades	16.442,5	20.049,4	24.900,5
. Presupuesto MEC (o MUI)	9.610,2	16.512,0	19.337,7
TOTAL	26.052,7	36.561,4	44.238,2
- Capítulo 2º:			
. Presupuesto Universidades	5.265,1	5.724,1	6.962,6
- Capítulo 4º (Presupuesto Universidades)	111,4	163,2	198,7
- Dotación global, a distribuir, Presupuesto MEC	266,9	235,9	103,3
TOTAL A)	31.696,1	42.684,6	51.503,8
B) OPERACIONES DE CAPITAL			
- Inversiones en construcción y equipamiento:			
. Junta de Construcciones, Instalaciones y Equipo Escolar	5.707,3	6.005,2	6.776,2
. Presupuesto Universidades	-	745,0	150,0
TOTAL ...	5.707,3	6.750,2	6.926,2
- Formación de Profesorado e Investigación educativa	579,6	579,6	393,0
- Investigación científica universitaria.	448,4	538,1	538,1
- Capítulo 8º Presupuesto Universidades	1,4	21,8	23,3
TOTAL B)	6.736,7	7.889,7	7.879,6
RESUMEN A + B	38.432,8	50.574,3	59.383,4

(1) Datos referidos a Presupuestos iniciales: No está incluido gasto del IHAIE

1.1 **Evolution of Universities Expenditures during the Period 1982-85(1)**

(In million pesetas)

A) Current Account

- Item 1:
  . Universities budget
  . Service 02, MEC Budget
  . Service 04, MEC Budget

  TOTAL

- Item 2:
  . Universities Budget
  . Service 02, MEC Budget

  TOTAL

- Item 4:
  (Universities Budget)
- Global allotment, to be distributed, (Service
  (Service 02 MEC Budget

  TOTAL A)

B) CAPITAL ACCOUNT

- Construction and equipment investments:

  . Constructions, facilities, and school equipment board

  . Universities Budget

  TOTAL

- Teachers training
- Educational research
- University scientific research

- Item 8, Universities Budget

TOTAL B)

SUMMARY A & B

(1) Data pertaining to initial Budgets. INAPE expenditures are not included.
(2) Included 588.97 million for Catalonia Polytechnical University Budget amendment budget amendment, to aic.

CUADRO COMPARATIVO DEL GASTO EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES, DURANTE EL PERIODO 1982-85 (1)

(en millones de pesetas)

	1982	1983	%Δ interanual	1984	%Δ interanual	1985	%Δ interanual	%Δ 1985/82
A) OPERACIONES CORRIENTES								
- Capítulo 1º:								
. Presupuesto Universidades	39.095,00	36.815,99	37,41	76.916,07	108,97	87.514,23(2)	13,78	
. Servicio 02 Presupuesto MEC	1.750,00	2.909,66	70,61	1.148,00	-61,55	1.559,73	35,86	
. Servicio 04 Presupuesto MEC	24.963,93	31.298,64	27,78	1.057,17	-96,69	1.610,72	52,36	
TOTAL	55.611,36	71.103,57	28,93	79.121,24	10,35	90.684,68	14,61	63,07
- Capítulo 2º:								
. Presupuesto Universidades	8.424,00	10.217,39	21,29	11.127,24	8,90	13.542,14	21,70	60,75
. Servicio 02 Presupuesto MEC	-	1.500,00		1.020,00	-32,00	600,00	-41,18	
TOTAL	8.424,00	11.717,39	39,09	12.147,24	3,67	14.142,14	16,42	67,80
- Capítulo 4º (Presupuesto Universidades)	241,92	309,62	27,98	421,60	36,17	448,85	6,46	85,54
- Dotación global, a distribuir, Servicio 02 Presupuesto MEC	156,82	710,60	360,17	471,00	-33,72	136,87	-71,14	-13,18
TOTAL A)	64.433,70	84.439,80	31,05	92.161,08	9,14	105.411,74	14,38	63,60
B) OPERACIONES DE CAPITAL								
- Inversiones en construcción y equipamiento:								
. Junta de Construcciones Instalaciones y Equipo Escolar	6.472,80	9.671,99	49,42	10.618,00	9,72	10.075,50	-5,11	55,66
. Presupuesto Universidades	2.000,00	2.200,00	10,00	2.231,70	1,44	655,60	-70,62	-67,22
TOTAL	8.472,80	11.871,99	40,12	12.849,70	8,24	10.731,10	16,49	26,65
- Formación de Profesorado	567,10	605,58	5,90	479,50	-20,16	-		
- Investigación educativa	300,00	300,20	0,20	294,30	-1,76	97,00	-12,51	-7,00
- Investigación científica Universitaria	661,10	721,27	9,10	713,30	-1,10	742,50	4,09	12,31
- Capítulo 8º Presupuesto Universidades	23,25	23,25	-	27,60	18,71	27,60	-	18,71
TOTAL B)	9.824,25	13.330,29	35,69	14.174,40	6,32	11.594,20	-18,21	18,02
RESUMEN A+B	74.256,03	97.770,09	31,67	106.337,48	8,77	117.003,94	10,03	57,57

(1) Datos referidos a Presupuestos iniciales. No está incluido gastos del INAPE
(2) Incluidos 500,97 millones concepto Presupuesto Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña

1.2 EVOLUTION OF UNIVERSITIES EXPENDITURES - SUMMARY TABLE

UNIVERSITIES EXPENDITURES FINANCING DURING THE PERIOD 1972-1985 INCLUDING CAPITAL ACCOUNTS (1)
(In million pesetas)

Year	State Financing	Per cent on total	Fees	Per cent on total	Other resources (residuals etc.)	Per cent on total	TOTAL

(1) Data pertaining to initial Budgets.

FINANCIACION DEL GASTO EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES, DURANTE EL PERIODO 1972-1985 INCLUIDAS OPERACIONES DE CAPITAL (1)

(En millones de pesetas)

Año	Financiación Estado	%sobre total	Tasas	%sobre total	Otros recursos (remanentes etc.)	%sobre total	TOTAL
1972	8.507,4	90,84	524,0	5,59	334,2	3,57	9.365,6
1973	8.734,5	90,64	665,1	6,90	237,2	2,46	9.636,8
1974	9.333,7	87,22	859,3	8,03	507,9	4,75	10.700,9
1975	11.566,3	87,85	941,3	7,15	658,8	5,00	13.166,4
1976	14.779,2	90,31	1.045,4	6,39	539,7	3,30	16.364,3
1977	21.104,8	92,16	1.703,4	7,44	90,6	0,40	22.898,8
1978	24.972,0	86,17	2.969,7	10,25	1.039,0	3,58	28.980,7
1979	31.301,8	81,45	5.667,2	14,74	1.463,8	3,81	38.432,8
1980	42.216,8	83,47	7.145,3	14,13	1.212,2	2,40	50.574,3
1981	47.927,3	80,71	9.603,9	16,17	1.851,2	3,12	59.382,4
1982	60.696,6	81,74	11.747,2	15,82	1.812,2	2,44	74.256,0
1983	81.094,5	82,94	15.408,1	15,76	1.267,4	1,30	97.770,0
1984	87.009,7	81,82	18.017,8	16,94	1.315,6	1,24	106.343,1
1985	91.764,5	78,43	23.745,9	20,29	1.494,0	1,28	117.004,4

(1) Datos referidos a Presupuestos iniciales.

(1) Global expenditure
Million Pesetas

(2) GNP Deflator

(3) Deflated global
expenditure

(4) GNP per capita
Thousand pts.

(5) Students
(approx. figure)

(6) Deflated expenditure
per student

(7) Deflated expenditure
per student as a per
cent of GNP per capita

	Gastos globales Millones de pts.	Deflactor del P.I.B.	Gastos globales deflactados	P.I.B. deflactado per cápita Miles de pts.	Alumnos (dato aproximado)	Gastos deflactados por alumnos	Gasto deflactado por alumno como % del P.I.B. per cápita.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1975	13.166,4	1	13.166,4	170.008	395.770	33.267,8	19,57
1976	16.364,3	1,167	14.022,3	173.060	455.282	30.799,1	17,9
1977	22.898,8	1,433	15.979,6	177.362	483.938	33.019,9	18,62
1978	28.980,7	1,722	16.829,7	176.573			
1979	38.432,8	2,010	19.120,8	176.713	571.141	33.478,2	18,94
1980	50.574,3	2,289	22.094,5	175.547			
1981	59.382,4	2,564	23.159,9	176.762	596.657	38.816	21,96
1982	74.256,0	2,916	25.465,0	178.953			
1983	97.770,0	3,255	30.036,8	181.300	670.377	44.805,9	24,71
1984	106.343,1	3,610	29.457,9	184.428	720.426	40.889,6	22,17
1985	117.004,4	3,923	29.825,2	191.153	759.426	39.273,39	20,55

ANNEX 2

DATA BREAKDOWN PER UNIVERSITY
(on initial Budgets)

In the Spanish financing mechanism data breakdown per type courses is not possible

SUMMARY OF UNIVERSITIES INCOME BUDGETS (in million pesetas)

RESUMEN DEL PRESUPUESTO DE INGRESOS DE UNIVERSIDADES

(en millones de ptas.)

UNIVERSIDADES	1.975	1.976	% Δ	1.977	% Δ	1.978	% Δ	1.979	% Δ	1.980	% Δ	1.981	% Δ	
Alcalá de Henares						98,1		194,8	127,81	221,1	43,01	285,8	29,17	
Alicante												306.2		
Baleares								171,7		214,9	25,16	246.9	14,89	
Barcelona	653,4	678,9	3,90	1.194,4	75,93	1.514,3	26,78	2.107,9	39,19	2.535,5	20,28	2.972.8	17,24	
Barcelona, Autónoma	352,2	348,8	8,56	566,2	62,43	781,7	38,65	1.029,9	30,86	1.221,8	18,65	1.365.8	11,80	
Barcelona, Politécnica	375,0	397,6	6,02	609,8	53,16	777,8	27,71	994,5	27,86	1.182,3	19,48	1.387,6	16,38	
País Vasco	347,8	319,8	-10,58	410,3	32,01	515,7	25,68	812,4	57,23	988,7	21,65	1.271,9	28,90	
Cádiz												383.7		
Córdoba	114,5	127,9	11,70	229,5	79,43	319,1	39,11	398,0	27,70	487,3	23,08	605 4	24,27	
Extremadura	74,2	81,1	9,29	135,9	67,57	264,3	94,49	385,2	38,17	436,2	13,44	527.4	20,90	
Granada	442,3	448,8	1,48	694,2	54,67	918,2	32,29	1.221,5	33,03	1.447,3	18,48	1.654.8	14,36	
La Laguna	214,2	233,3	8,91	380,2	62,98	466,3	22,69	657,0	42,97	884,2	32,56	868 2	-1,80	
Las Palmas												272 7		
Lleida												316 6		
Madrid, Complutense	1.378,9	1.438,9	4,30	2.480,6	71,88	3.042,1	23,63	3.643,8	19,77	4.348,2	19,1:	6.844 9	31,87	
Madrid, Autónoma	348,3	351,3	1,44	564,4	60,66	744,8	31,92	947,3	27,38	1.140,1	20,37	1.329 0	16,56	
Madrid, Politécnica	933,8	982,9	7,71	979,8	43,57	1.385,0	41,36	1.737,8	25,48	2.090,8	20,30	2.470 1	18,14	
Málaga	89,8	112,9	25,58	196,5	74,38	283,3	44,17	385,1	34,18	479,8	24,22	586 2	22,17	
Murcia	132,7	158,7	19,56	299,1	32,11	382,7	41,98	488,2	44,39	631,5	20,40	819 1	29,84	
Oviedo	289,2	293,8	1,59	452,6	54,05	573,1	26,62	795,7	38,84	1.004,5	26,24	978 3	-2,60	
Salamanca	784,4	765,7	-2,37	364,8	37,29	496,5	27,87	631,7	27,55	718,8	13,73	882 0	23,70	
Cantabria	87,3	102,4	24,42	152,7	49,.2	234,6	53,63	297,1	26,50	341,7	14,86	413 2	20,92	
Santiago	238,3	287,7	20,73	437,7	52,10	534,8	35,92	798,7	33,94	1.115,3	39,98	1.318.9	18,25	
Sevilla	495,8	529,5	6,84	763,5	44,19	.017,3	33,24	1.285,5	26,34	1.529,7	18,68	1.568,6	0,97	
Valencia	374,2	384,0	4,73	512,8	55,48	819,3	13,23	1.111,7	35,63	1.389,9	24,84	1.555,5	11,91	
Valencia, Politécnica	175,2	187,2	9,84	275,9	47,38	352,7	27,83	538,4	52,65	657,5	22,12	784,9	19,33	
Valladolid	280,7	315,7	8,59	513,5	64,35	675,2	29,87	781,4	3,88	843,7	30,28	987,2	17,00	
Zaragoza	349,1	341,1	-1,44	480,4	48,83	683,3	35,58	794,8	31,74	998,5	25,65	1.138,5	17,55	
U.N.E.D.	329,0	390,4	9,54	552,7	53,53	698,2	26,32	823,5	17,94	1.388,8	32,21	1.227,2	12,71	
Internacional Menéndez Pela												255.5		
Castellano-Manchega														
TOTAL.....	8.931,7	9.441,1	5,09	13.234,5	58,78	17.39:,4	31,40	22.753,1	30,82	27.873,9	22,28	33.376,1	19,95	

RESUMEN DEL PRESUPUESTO DE INGRESOS DE UNIVERSIDADES (en millones de pts.)

UNIVERSIDADES	1.982	Δ %	1.983	Δ %	1.984	Δ %	1.985	Δ %	1.986	Δ %	1.987	Δ %		
Alcalá de Henares	375,5	31,47	476,4	26,87	1.038,7	118,03	1.222,0	17,64	1.431,8	17,15	2.847,7	98,91		
Alicante	469,2	53,23	647,2	37,93	1.086,1	67,81	1.387,4	27,78						
Baleares	312,1	26,40	483,7	29,34	737,1	82,58	933,5	26,64	1.087,8	16,58	1.509,2	38,67		
Barcelona	3.676,4	23,68	4.480,2	21,86	6.987,1	55,95	7.913,5	13,25						
Barcelona, Autónoma	1.657,1	2',32	2.845,4	73,43	3.906,2	71,61	4.009,9	14,33						
Barcelona, Politécnica	1.792,7	76,37	2.168,5	20,39	3.397,3	81,84	4.013,8	18,16						
País Vasco	1.672,5	31,49	2.308,1	37,82	3.887,2	68,63	4.555,3	17,18						
Cádiz	529,3	37,23	708,8	33,76	1.304,3	84,22	1.500,7	15,05	1.761,3	17,36				
Córdoba	748,3	29,86	976,1	27,06	1.981,9	104,08	2.281,2	14,12	2.536,4	11,18				
Extremadura	650,8	23,35	800,0	22,96	1.575,2	96,90	1.787,2	14,09	2.092,2	16,41	2.596,5	24,09		
Granada	2.008,9	21,33	2.452,2	22,18	4.699,5	91,25	5.447,7	18,58	6.042,9	10,91				
La Laguna	1.077,7	24,13	1.375,3	27,61	2.782,5	102,31	3.083,9	9,35	3.408,4	11,68				
Las Palmas	374,2	37,22	514,9	37,60	911,5	77,02	1.068,2	17,30	1.186,2	10,94				
León	437,2	38,97	607,2	38,88	1.107,8	82,44	1.322,7	19,68	1.485,4	12,04	1.822,7	22,70		
Madrid, Complutense	5.852,8	29,80	7.610,7	19,93	11.225,5	99,91	12.978,8	15,59	13.683,8	5,45	17.323,1	26,59		
Madrid, Autónoma	1.648,9	23,92	1.970,1	19,62	3.839,5	94,88	3.852,9	0,42	4.247,9	10,27	6.874,8	61,82		
Madrid, Politécnica	2.981,0	20,68	3.556,7	19,31	6.348,7	78,44	7.781,0	21,53	8.380,5	7,29	10.316,4	24,06		
Málaga	724,4	22,57	949,4	31,06	1.991,2	109,73	2.193,5	10,15	2.421,5	10,39				
Murcia	787,0	27,12	987,1	25,42	1.968,8	139,97	2.288,3	16,04	2.823,0	4,53	4.087,2	37,09		
Oviedo	1.210,3	23,71	1.488,6	22,99	2.985,9	99,21	3.394,4	16,45	3.731,2	10,24	5.074,5	36,08		
Salamanca	1.104,9	23,27	1.385,7	25,40	2.843,7	105,22	3.112,4	9,44	3.502,0	12,51	4.877,1	39,26		
Cantabria	499,4	70,86	818,3	23,80	1.327,2	114,65	1.902,9	15,20	1.845,6	9,52	2.434,9	47,96		
Santiago	1.048,5	24,83	2.213,8	34,52	4.157,9	87,71	4.831,0	16,18	5.248,6	8,60	7.959,8	51,69		
Sevilla	1.921,8	24,74	2.345,5	22,04	4.320,5	84,80	4.918,0	14,29	5.539,4	12,17				
Valencia	1.919,4	23,39	2.283,2	24,68	4.152,9	73,92	4.872,0	17,49						
Valencia, Politécnica	975,9	27,58	1.184,5	21,37	2.108,9	78,08	2.558,4	21,37						
Valladolid	1.260,7	21,62	1.585,3	30,38	2.920,0	84,58	3.378,2	15,64	3.763,5	11,47	4.808,3	27,76		
Zaragoza	1.406,4	23,53	1.794,7	27,60	3.698,5	105,98	4.129,8	11,68	4.499,7	9,13	6.020,2	33,79		
U.N.E.D.	1.422,3	15,83	1.751,0	23,11	3.017,0	38,03	3.625,8	8,43	2.345,0	12,18	4.292,4	45,72		
Internacional Menéndez Pela	292,5	14,49	337,2	14,59	338,0	-1,95	437,1	30,93	472,1	9,35	544,5	15,33		
Castellano-Manchega					78,5		95,3	24,51	1.078,5	.031,68	1.191,5	10,50		
TOTAL	41.351,4	23,89	51.441,2	24,40	92.828,5	79,98	108.698,8	14,64	84.993,0	-19,52	84.492,5	-0,58		

UNIVERSIDADES	1.975	1.976	% Δ	1.977	% Δ	1.978	% Δ	1.979	% Δ	1.980	% Δ	1.981	% Δ	
Alcalá de Henares						12,3		7,8	-36,58	14,8	87,17	37,9	155,42	
Alicante												52,9		
Baleares								43,4		54,8	26,26	53,4	-15,19	
Barcelona	84,7	92,4	7,31	194,9	97,84	228,0	52,35	543,7	151,58	837,2	41,01	1.108,9	32,45	
Barcelona, Autónoma	78,8	42,8	48,61	60,8	42,41	126,8	81,89	274,3	116,88	276,2	0,69	351,7	27,33	
Barcelona, Politécnica	36,5	36,5		108,8	197,85	118,4	9,02	284,7	72,88	247,5	20,90	342,3	38,30	
País Vasco	38,7	34,1	77,91	60,8	75,95	104,9	76,50	213,8	181,88	269,8	28,19	426,7	58,15	
Cádiz												97,8		
Córdoba	7,8	11,2	60,00		-100,00	35,8		83,9	133,70	173,3	48,96	143,7	16,54	
Extremadura	5,3	8,3	56,88	8,8	6,02	22,7	157,95	75,6	233,03	86,2	14,02	138,3	60,44	
Granada	51,7	53,1	3,90	80,8	12,78	130,1	116,83	313,7	141,12	382,8	22,02	487,7	27,40	
La Laguna	18,0	24,0	55,08	22,3	-17,91	73,5	40,53	150,9	105,30	203,8	34,92	197,7	-2,89	
Las Palmas												35,4		
León												48,8		
Madrid, Complutense	189,4	138,7	4,91	333,8	67,89	644,3	93,13	781,4	21,27	998,3	27,83	1.351,6	35,30	
Madrid, Autónoma	30,0	31,3	4,33	81,1	159,10	81,2	0,12	208,2	156,60	286,2	37,46	394,7	37,91	
Madrid, Politécnica	70,1	71,4	2,13	91,9	30,72	177,7	89,85	387,7	118,17	448,5	15,68	579,1	29,11	
Málaga	12,0	14,7	22,58	32,0	117,68	41,5	29,68	87,9	111,80	111,4	26,73	137,5	23,51	
Murcia	17,5	21,1	20,57	34,7	17,06	19,3	140,88	137,0	129,34	159,4	17,20	222,7	39,71	
Oviedo	42,3	42,2	-0,23	69,7	65,16	107,5	54,21	238,5	93,95	244,0	17,02	321,7	31,84	
Salamanca	24,3	24,1		37,7	56,14	85,8	125,46	133,6	53,32	186,3	37,38	267,3	43,47	
Cantabria	7,5	10,5	40,00	17,0	61,90	29,1	71,17	51,4	76,63	58,9	14,59	88,5	50,25	
Santiago	41,8	26,7	38,28	76,4	34,74	137,1	79,45	246,8	80,01	323,3	30,99	491,5	52,02	
Sevilla	55,9	67,3	22,18	132,5	52,38	187,1	83,41	338,7	114,74	444,4	23,54	427,3	-3,84	
Valencia	83,9	72,7	-12,48	88,2	24,07	178,9	98,1	375,9	112,48	489,1	24,74	534,7	13,38	
Valencia, Politécnica	12,9	17,3	34,10	18,6	7,51	51,5	175,80	95,5	88,15	123,8	29,63	150,7	21,72	
Valladolid	39,5	43,3	9,62	75,8	75,01	131,8	73,73	188,4	42,94	228,1	28,0	292,3	28,17	
Zaragoza	37,4	41,1	9,89	81,3	97,81	121,1	97,15	252,3	108,34	302,6	19,93	423,8	40,71	
U.N.E.D.	21,9	33,0	37,98	75,1	193,68	97,1	27,93	190,1	95,77	266,7	40,03	381,7	43,16	
Internacional Menéndez Pel														
Castellano-Manchega														
TOTAL AREAS ACADEMICAS....	941,4	1.043,3		1.703,5		2.988,8		6.647,7		7.245,1		9.678,7		

UNIVERSIDADES	1.982	Δ %	1.983	Δ %	1.984	Δ %	1.985	Δ %	1.986	Δ %	1.987	Δ %		
Alcalá de Henares	58,6	38,37	85,5	45,99	138,5	61,98	197,3	42,45	259,9	31,72	338,0	30,09		
Alicante	79,0	41,77	113,3	81,66	203,4	79,52	322,3	58,45						
Baleares	76,4	23,58	97,8	28,01	112,5	15,03	178,8	58,22	159,1	-11,74	214,1	49,01		
Barcelona	1.352,8	21,92	1.708,3	26,34	2.019,2	18,18	2.790,4	38,18						
Barcelona, Autónoma	429,1	22,88	563,0	31,20	676,3	20,12	955,9	41,34						
Barcelona, Politécnica	388,8	13,58	459,6	17,18	519,9	14,11	7[illegible]	38,73						
País Vasco	528,4	22,42	802,3	51,57	922,7	15,00	1.152,4	24,84						
Cádiz	136,1	17,39	160,4	25,67	194,7	13,81	259,7	41,[illegible]	248,2	-10,29				
Córdoba	168,1	15,72	239,1	43,77	274,9	14,97	321,2	17,29	403,4	25,70				
Extremadura	139,8	1,08	172,8	23,80	206,4	19,44	287,4	39,24	338,4	17,74	423,8	29,17		
Granada	513,3	9,08	722,3	40,99	843,8	16,82	1.160,8	38,14	1.160,6	- 0,01				
La Laguna	264,4	23,87	338,9	27,23	437,1	40,19	543,1	24,28	513,8	- 5,54				
Las Palmas	50,6	43,18	68,4	18,89	76,9	27,31	114,0	48,24	117,9	3,42				
León	99,1	39,68	175,8	82,93	199,8	13,65	273,0	36,62	237,1	- 5,82	314,8	32,64		
Madrid, Complutense	1.732,1	28,21	2.087,7	20,47	2.311,9	10,73	3.183,8	38,78	3.377,9	6,08	4.089,0	18,41		
Madrid, Autónoma	470,4	19,17	579,7	23,23	664,7	15,08	808,8	21,31	713,9	-11,73	1.317,7	84,98		
Madrid, Politécnica	891,2	18,38	979,5	41,71	1.126,6	14,99	1.647,3	49,79	1.798,7	6,68	2.127,4	18,27		
Málaga	180,4	31,25	218,4	21,04	257,3	17,78	349,1	43,45	429,9	14,83				
Murcia	264,5	18,37	323,8	24,38	421,4	29,88	555,0	31,70	574,4	3,48	788,0	21,86		
Oviedo	408,2	26,88	537,6	38,47	681,4	12,91	802,7	33,47	704,9	-12,18	1.005,7	52,68		
Salamanca	313,3	17,20	391,8	24,80	452,8	15,75	637,2	40,78	613,1	- 3,78	858,0	39,35		
Cantabria	111,8	23,42	130,8	17,83	172,8	31,95	251,5	45,71	253,3	- 0,47	313,0	25,04		
Santiago	616,2	23,37	836,4	35,73	883,2	6,31	1.321,7	49,67	1.744,0	- 5,87	2.180,0	68,81		
Sevilla	382,1	38,22	529,2	38,78	875,4	15,80	1.234,2	40,98	1.251,6	1,40				
Valencia	638,4	17,88	785,4	24,58	924,7	17,73	1.192,4	28,94						
Valencia, Politécnica	283,7	21,84	355,2	38,92	316,8	24,13	477,3	50,66						
Valladolid	326,9	11,52	459,3	41,87	501,2	8,38	748,9	53,35	744,5	- 2,87	950,3	29,87		
Zaragoza	495,6	14,39	631,4	27,40	776,5	19,06	1.035,7	42,58	1.103,1	6,50	1.389,5	25,94		
U.N.E.D.	484,7	27,06	734,8	51,75	928,0	25,70	1.184,0	28,49	1.203,9	1,68	2.309,3	91,81		
Internacional Menéndez Pel	10,9		13,1	73,22	27,8	44,38	45,2	64, 3	36,2	24,08	52,7	27,58		
Castellano-Manchega									108,4		165,2	52,33		
TOTAL TASAS ACADEMICAS....	11.247,9		15.908,0		18.017,8		24.797,8		27.803,4		38.900,3			

UNIVERSIDADES	1.975	1.976	% Δ	1.977	% Δ	1.978	% Δ	1.979	% Δ	1.980	% Δ	1.981	% Δ	
Alcalá de Henares						75,1		142,1	157,89	183,7	29,27	202,2	10,07	
Alicante	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	240,9	-	
Baleares								123,5		142,6	15,18	156,9	10,02	
Barcelona	497,8	520,8	4,59	1.001,0	92,20	1.158,2	15,70	1.310,3	13,13	1.478,5	12,83	1.626,3	9,99	
Barcelona, Autónoma	256,4	268,1	4,48	470,7	75,56	582,5	23,75	621,4	6,71	823,7	33,47	935,2	12,71	
Barcelona, Politécnica	279,7	328,2	17,35	481,1	46,58	610,0	26,79	782,8	15,37	846,8	20,31	956,9	13,00	
País Vasco	289,6	249,2	23,00	331,9	33,18	346,1	4,27	510,9	47,41	623,8	22,26	758,4	21,57	
Cádiz												253,2		
Córdoba	99,3	109,5	10,27	193,9	77,07	246,4	27,07	263,7	9,45	323,1	19,79	401,0	24,11	
Extremadura	84,7	98,1	5,22	120,6	77,09	211,1	75,04	247,6	17,29	311,8	25,92	348,1	11,64	
Granada	333,2	360,1	8,17	599,4	66,45	707,5	18,02	777,6	9,90	920,0	18,31	1.026,2	11,54	
La Laguna	179,6	184,8	4,00	303,6	62,63	347,8	14,48	483,0	38,87	603,3	24,90	583,3	- 3,31	
Las Palmas												225,9		
León												217,9		
Madrid, Complutense	1.041,2	1.082,3	3,93	1.998,5	84,65	2.188,9	8,42	2.568,3	18,45	2.881,8	12,22	3.161,5	9,73	
Madrid, Autónoma	287,2	320,0	4,45	488,3	35,43	571,6	22,58	617,0	7,94	765,8	24,11	845,1	10,35	
Madrid, Politécnica	325,9	379,4	10,17	671,2	58,38	1.114,8	27,96	1.426,5	10,01	1.437,7	17,21	1.652,7	14,98	
Málaga	79,0	91,7	11,90	136,1	78,22	213,9	37,02	267,4	19,96	319,8	28,94	383,3	20,15	
Murcia	98,5	103,3	9,11	151,0	43,33	173,5	19,87	203,7	13,48	270,1	32,59	330,5	22,36	
Oviedo	181,1	196,3	8,32	330,2	68,21	374,7	14,88	494,8	32,67	583,0	18,64	524,8	- 9,98	
Salamanca	193,2	193,1	-0,01	283,7	46,91	316,1	11,42	464,0	19,13	457,4	24,81	537,5	17,98	
Cantabria	80,8	82,8	36,19	128,5	55,19	175,7	36,71	89,4	13,48	748,3	23,52	255,8	3,85	
Santiago	127,4	183,2	8,90	341,5	78,75	384,1	13,08	451,6	17,01	681,9	36,92	749,4	9,89	
Sevilla	313,8	398,9	19,43	633,4	58,43	761,1	22,08	903,2	5,26	993,0	13,95	995,2	4,62	
Valencia	233,4	279,7	19,37	490,7	75,43	559,5	14,04	688,6	18,04	888,3	22,35	879,4	8,67	
Valencia, Politécnica	128,1	149,3	16,54	248,6	66,51	273,4	9,97	404,8	48,09	459,8	13,55	503,9	18,02	
Valladolid	222,3	251,9	12,79	421,3	67,31	382,2	-10,20	423,7	-10,83	529,9	25,05	615,0	16,05	
Zaragoza	284,3	295,5	3,58	370,4	39,58	404,1	9,03	453,5	12,22	552,5	21,83	605,9	9,66	
U.N.E.D.	149,8	149,7	15,89	334,0	99,81	378,7	13,38	429,3	2,31	438,2	15,52	482,0	9,99	
Internacional Menéndez Pela												719,5		
Castellano-Manchega														
TOTAL CAPITAL U.....	5.[illegible]	5.429,4		10.218,0		12.657,1		14.489,6		17.801,2		20.629,9		

EVOLUCION DE LOS INGRESOS POR SUBVENCION DEL ESTADO (CAPITULO IV)

(en millones de pts.)

UNIVERSIDADES	1.982	Δ %	1.983	Δ %	1.984	Δ %	1.985	Δ %	1.986	Δ %	1.987	Δ %		
Alcalá de Henares	251,8	24,53	336,9	33,79	841,6	149,80	946,9	12,51	1.135,7	19,92	1.351,7	19,01		
Alicante	351,3	45,82	489,5	39,33	921,2	87,76	1.031,5	11,99	-		-	-		
Baleares	187,2	19,37	266,7	42,39	578,0	116,72	729,1	26,14	901,2	23,60	1.097,8	21,81		
Barcelona	1.945,3	19,61	2.399,7	23,35	4.674,0	94,77	4.352,0	6,89	-		-	-		
Barcelona, Autónoma	1.052,9	12,58	1.278,8	21,47	2.684,3	109,87	2.941,0	9,56	-		-	-		
Barcelona, Politécnica	1.141,9	21,42	1.438,6	23,81	2.765,4	90,83	3.230,6	17,84	-		-	-		
País Vasco	942,9	26,98	1.319,6	37,04	2.816,7	113,45	3.322,4	7,95	-		-	-		
Cádiz	322,6	27,60	481,3	43,18	1.028,5	122,84	1.183,4	15,11	1.431,8	22,43	-			
Córdoba	496,1	23,71	625,1	26,00	1.589,1	157,42	1.878,5	18,24	2.057,2	9,50	-			
Extremadura	478,9	22,63	533,5	24,97	1.274,9	138,98	1.446,3	13,05	1.729,3	17,30	2.101,1	22,13		
Granada	1.238,9	20,53	1.508,9	21,82	3.687,8	142,72	4.156,0	13,68	4.781,9	15,08	-			
La Laguna	673,7	14,98	943,8	41,01	2.213,9	135,76	2.433,6	9,21	2.785,1	14,38	-			
Las Palmas	287,6	27,31	417,9	45,33	789,5	88,92	923,3	16,98	1.018,2	9,34	-			
León	277,1	27,16	364,3	31,48	835,2	127,51	1.006,7	20,53	1.182,5	16,47	1.373,9	16,16		
Madrid, Complutense	3.518,5	11,29	4.355,6	23,79	8.344,1	91,57	9.366,7	12,25	9.768,9	4,29	11.621,1	18,96		
Madrid, Autónoma	935,2	17,76	1.208,6	29,24	3.022,2	150,08	2.887,3	-4,46	3.432,1	18,82	3.988,5	16,21		
Madrid, Politécnica	1.918,7	15,88	2.285,4	19,12	4.997,2	117,34	5.883,1	17,72	6.284,7	6,88	7.202,8	14,60		
Málaga	456,1	18,89	622,1	36,39	1.626,8	161,50	1.723,9	5,97	1.925,6	11,65	-			
Murcia	395,9	19,78	529,8	31,54	1.823,6	244,15	2.173,0	19,16	2.284,1	5,10	2.783,5	21,85		
Oviedo	615,6	17,39	777,1	26,23	2.187,7	171,16	2.630,0	20,22	2.900,9	10,30	3.422,8	17,99		
Salamanca	679,7	18,25	839,6	27,03	2.223,8	164,84	2.578,0	15,93	2.783,8	7,99	3.326,4	19,52		
Cantabria	308,9	17,63	393,6	30,80	1.027,3	161,03	1.146,0	11,55	1.323,8	15,49	1.590,2	20,14		
Santiago	848,3	13,19	1.204,2	41,95	3.109,8	158,24	3.476,7	11,81	3.884,8	11,73	4.753,5	22,36		
Sevilla	1.873,5	12,38	2.323,7	23,98	5.218,1	143,02	5.534,8	6,07	6.139,2	10,98	-			
Valencia	1.828,4	17,87	2.351,7	31,63	5.998,8	155,09	6.339,8	5,68	-		-	-		
Valencia, Politécnica	570,1	13,88	832,9	46,61	1.670,8	107,63	2.139,4	28,09	-		-	-		
Valladolid	711,8	15,73	933,2	31,14	2.259,2	142,14	2.630,6	16,42	2.909,1	10,60	3.514,7	20,81		
Zaragoza	884,0	12,88	955,3	38,04	2.753,5	188,24	2.913,1	5,74	3.247,6	9,47	4.383,1	32,50		
U.N.E.D.	533,5	10,68	618,2	14,37	1.178,9	84,81	1.164,5	-1,15	1.537,7	29,54	1.605,7	4,42		
Internacional Menéndez Pela	240,5	9,54	273,3	13,72	239,0	-12,56	369,8	54,83	538,4	45,56	627,7	15,07		
Castellano-Navarro	-	-	-	-	61,2	-	78,3	27,94	881,3	733,92	929,5	40,59		
TOTAL CAPITULO IV	24.138,5		30.816,0		69.164,5		77.710,6		84.782,0		98.384,0			

(continued page 48)

ANNEX 3: SCHOLARSHIPS AND AIDS SYSTEM; EVOLUTION OF CREDIT GRANTED PER EDUCATION LEVEL (1)

(Figures in thousand pesetas)

Pre-School	E.G.B. (3)	F.P. (4)	B.U.P. C.O.U. (5)	UNIVERSITY

Source: I.N.A.P.E.

(1) This table attempts to offer a general view of the main educational levels. Therefore grants for "other courses" (whose magnitude is not relevant) are not included neither are included those related to special aid requests. Nor are included in this table dining hall and transportations for E.G.B. level.

(2) Data pertaining to 1976-77 until 1981-82 reer to "approved applications". From 1982-83 these data pertain to "paid up scholarships".

(3) Basic General Education

(4) Trade Training

(5) University Oriented Course

SISTEMA DE BECAS Y AYUDAS: EVOLUCION DE CREDITOS CONCEDIDOS POR NIVELES EDUCATIVOS (1). (cifras en miles de pesetas)

	PREESCOLAR	E.G.B.	F.P.	B.U.P. C.O.U.	UNIVERSIDAD
1976-77		145.800	835.462	1.329.219	1.749.999
1977-78	95.643	144.882	1.035.842	1.682.988	2.336.025
1978-79	163.960	93.942	1.244.345	2.648.699	2.158.835
1979-80	377.430	202.347	1.840.088	2.480.377	3.120.568
1980-81	1.299.315	320.334	1.144.406	3.643.690	3.302.511
1981-82	1.112.305	846.995	1.444.275	3.450.100	3.698.300
1982-83	957.510	630.310	1.038.080	2.722.625	3.049.102
1983-84 (2)	1.538.798	1.149.083	1.294.974	3.260.561	3.964.894
1984-85 (2)	1.036.803	920.466	1.850.805	3.624.706	6.141.431
1985-86 (2)	617.232	713.745	3.567.840	5.178.215	8.922.384

Fuente: I.N.A.P.E.

(1) El cuadro pretende ofrecer un panorama general en los principales niveles educativos. No se han incluido en el mismo, por tanto, el crédito correspondiente a "otros estudios" (cuya magnitud es poco relevante) ni tampoco los que corresponden a convocatorias de ayudas especiales. Tampoco se incluyen en el cuadro las ayudas de comedor y transporte en E.G.B.

(2) Los datos correspondientes a los años 1976-77 hasta 1981-82 se refieren a "solicitudes aceptadas". A partir de 1982-83, se refieren a "becas efectivamente pagadas".

Number of aids to college sudents and amount of such aids during the last three years

Year	Number of aids	Average amount in pts
84-85	80.198	76.578
85-86	113.884	78.346
86-87	135.582	90.370

+15.982 fees exemptions